In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 11-633V Filed: December 29, 2014 Not for Publication

MILLMAN, Special Master

DECISION AWARDING ATTORNEYS' FEES AND COSTS¹

Petitioner submitted his request for attorneys' fees and costs to respondent. During informal discussions, respondent raised objections to certain aspects of petitioner's application. Based on these objections, petitioner amends his application for attorneys' fees and costs to \$83,600.00. On December 23, 2014, respondent's counsel emailed the undersigned's law clerk, reciting these events and stating that respondent does not object to this amount. The undersigned finds this amount to be reasonable. In accordance with General Order #9, petitioner's counsel asserts that petitioner did not incur any costs in pursuit of his petition.

¹ Because this unpublished decision contains a reasoned explanation for the special master's action in this case, the special master intends to post this unpublished decision on the United States Court of Federal Claims's website, in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002, Pub. L. No. 107-347, 116 Stat. 2899, 2913 (Dec. 17, 2002). Vaccine Rule 18(b) states that all decisions of the special masters will be made available to the public unless they contain trade secrets or commercial or financial information that is privileged and confidential, or medical or similar information whose disclosure would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of privacy. When such a decision is filed, petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact such information prior to the document's disclosure. If the special master, upon review, agrees that the identified material fits within the banned categories listed above, the special master shall redact such material from public access.

Accordingly, the court awards \$83,600.00, representing reimbursement for attorneys' fees and costs. The award shall be in the form of a check payable jointly to petitioner and Law Offices of Jay A. Bansal for \$83,600.00.

In the absence of a motion for review filed pursuant to RCFC Appendix B, the clerk of the court is directed to enter judgment herewith.²

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: December 29, 2014

/s/ Laura D. Millman Laura D. Millman Special Master

² Pursuant to Vaccine Rule 11(a), entry of judgment can be expedited by each party, either separately or jointly, filing a notice renouncing the right to seek review.